

HIGHLIGHTING THE 2017 MIAMI WALK TO END ALZHEIMER'S

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight the 2017 Miami Walk to End Alzheimer's that will take place at Museum Park in downtown Miami on Saturday, November 4.

Alzheimer's is a devastating disease that impacts over 54,000 seniors in my county of Miami Dade and more than 500,000 individuals across the Sunshine State. It is not just the patients who suffer. Family members and caregivers also bear the brunt of this tragic and emotionally draining disease.

I know this personally, having lost my mother due to complications from Alzheimer's 6 years ago. The Miami Walk to End Alzheimer's plays an essential role in helping advance Alzheimer's care and research in our community and across our Nation.

This wonderful event is also important to patients, families, and caregivers as a reminder that they have the full support of our community as they battle this terrible disease.

I encourage everyone in our south Florida community to come out on November 4 and support and raise awareness for Alzheimer's.

OAKLAND COUNTY WATER MAIN BREAK AND INFRASTRUCTURE CRISIS

(Mrs. LAWRENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to address the infrastructure crisis our country is facing.

Today, in Oakland County, Michigan, in the heart of my district, we are struggling with a major water main break. In my district, schools are being closed and hospitals are transporting patients to nearby areas. It will be days before the region will receive access to reliable, safe drinking water.

This is not an isolated incident. We are not investing in our Nation's infrastructure. Not surprisingly, Michigan's infrastructure received a D grade from the American Society of Civil Engineers. This is unacceptable.

Lack of investment, lack of action is a matter of public health and public safety. It is a matter of life and death. It is obvious today in my district, but also in districts across this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues not to ignore this crisis. We need an infrastructure plan. Flint, Michigan, showed us that infrastructure is about the lives of American citizens. Let's work together to fix our Nation's infrastructure.

FUNDS GOING TO DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE STARKIST CONSENT DECREE STAY ON THE ISLAND

(Mrs. RADEWAGEN asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in care and concern for my people in American Samoa in a time of need. I am humbled to represent them to you now.

Over this Thanksgiving, 2,000 of our families are being put out of work and small businesses will lose commerce as American Samoa's only large employer closes for a period of 6 weeks.

The Department of Justice Starkist Consent Decree requires payment of \$6.3 million. Unfortunately, this money comes to Washington, D.C. The workers and their families lose their paychecks. The small businesses around them absorb losses. That is wrong. These funds should stay on the island to help them through this time.

In fact, a case won by Attorney General Talauega establishes the unique economic responsibility the U.S. has to American Samoa through the Deed of Cession.

American Samoa has high unemployment and low incomes. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the burden our Federal Government is placing on American Samoa this Thanksgiving.

□ 1215

RESIGNATIONS AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignations as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Homeland Security:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 24, 2017.

Speaker PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: Due to my election to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, this letter is to inform you that I resign my seats on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and the House Homeland Security Committee. It has been a privilege and an honor to serve with Chairmen Royce and McCaul as a subcommittee chair.

Blessings in Liberty,

JEFF DUNCAN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 579

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the fol-

lowing standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE: Mr. Duncan of South Carolina.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 469, SUNSHINE FOR REGULATIONS AND REGULATORY DECREES AND SETTLEMENTS ACT OF 2017, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 732, STOP SETTLEMENT SLUSH FUNDS ACT OF 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 577 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 577

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 469) to impose certain limitations on consent decrees and settlement agreements by agencies that require the agencies to take regulatory action in accordance with the terms thereof, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-34. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to

clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 732) to limit donations made pursuant to settlement agreements to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendments recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on House Resolution 577, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring this rule forward on behalf of the Rules Committee. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 469, the Sunshine for Regulations and Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act, and H.R. 732, the Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Judi-

ciary Committee for each of the bills under consideration, and also provides for a motion to recommit on both bills. Additionally, the rule makes in order six amendments to each bill, respectively, representing ideas from Members on both sides of the aisle.

Yesterday, the Rules Committee received testimony from Judiciary Committee Chairman BOB GOODLATTE and Representative JAMIE RASKIN. In addition to the discussion of the underlying legislation at the Rules Committee, I previously joined my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee in a robust debate of the major components of these bills at Judiciary markups earlier this year.

I introduced H.R. 469 to address a problem that, unfortunately, has become all too common: the practice of regulating behind closed doors and absent public input through what is known as sue and settle agreements.

H.R. 469 also includes the Judgment Fund Transparency Act, introduced by Representative CHRIS STEWART, and the Article I Amicus and Intervention Act, introduced by Judiciary Committee Chairman BOB GOODLATTE.

The rule also provides for consideration of the Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act, which was introduced after an extensive investigation by the House Judiciary Committee found that the Department of Justice was systematically circumventing Congress and directing settlement money to activist groups.

The legislation provided for by today's rule strengthens the balance of power and Congress' Article I authority, which we have allowed executive agencies to erode over time.

Regardless of the political party in power, Congress has a constitutional obligation to carry out its duties and ensure that the legislative branch writes the law. When Congress fulfills its role as intended, the Federal Government is more responsive to the needs of the electorate and more accountable to our citizenry.

My legislation, the Sunshine for Regulations and Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act, otherwise known as sue and settle, addresses the problem of regulation through litigation. We have seen this problem explode in recent years, particularly under the previous administration.

Mr. Speaker, I could offer you dozens of examples of this abuse, yet my time would expire long before I could list them all. A few particularly notable examples, however, highlight the enormous costs and burdens that regulation through litigation can impose on unsuspecting Americans.

The infamous Utility MACT and Boiler MACT rules resulted from sue and settle cases. They carry price tags of \$9.6 billion and \$3 billion in costs and compliance, respectively.

The Chesapeake Bay Clean Water Act rules boast a whopping \$18 billion in compliance costs. These rules also resulted from covert sue and settle maneuvers.

I don't think it is fair to ask hard-working job creators, farmers, and ranchers of northeast Georgia—or anywhere in this Nation, for that matter—to foot the bills for policy that bureaucrats secretly put in place.

I am sad to report that the prevalence of these sue and settlement agreements have only grown in recent years. The second term of the previous administration brought us 77 sue and settle cases related to the Clean Air Act. By comparison, President Clinton's second term witnessed 27 sue and settle cases, and President Bush's second term saw 28 such cases.

But let me also say just right there, Mr. Speaker, that it doesn't matter which administration or which party is in the White House. This is not a bill that is designed to go for one party or another. It is simply saying that there is an Article I of the Constitution, and that is the legislative branch that writes the laws, and then the executive is to enforce the laws, not write them. I want to make it clear—and I know it is going to be talked about that this is not, but I do want to make it clear that this is for any administration.

The Obama administration's penchant for circumventing Congress and its constitutional authority was incredible, and its legacy has endured. The weight of these improper agreements hangs around the necks of American businesses, employees, farmers, and ranchers.

Fortunately, the Trump administration has recognized the impropriety of this practice and is taking steps to start curbing abuse of sue and settle agreements and the Federal rule-making process. In fact, EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt recently issued a directive to increase public engagement in policymaking at the EPA.

This is a critical step and one that I applaud, but it doesn't negate the need for Congress to act decisively. In fact, it only highlights it. Congress has a right and an obligation to defend its constitutional prerogatives.

Like the Sunshine for Regulations and Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act, the Judgment Fund Transparency Act will make our government more accountable to the people by providing real transparency. The Judgment Fund Transparency Act is based upon the principle that the American people have the right to know how their government is spending their hard-earned tax dollars.

The Judgment Fund was created over 50 years ago as a way to provide for efficient payment of lawful claims against the U.S., but it has become a permanent appropriation shrouded in secrecy.

While many payments out of the Judgment Fund are both legitimate and appropriate, the fund remains the subject of egregious abuse. For example, last year, the administration paid Iran \$1.3 billion out of the Judgment Fund—primarily in the form of foreign currency—as a payment for the interest that had accrued on Iranian assets

that had been frozen because Iran sponsors terrorism without shame. As you might imagine, the Obama administration stonewalled congressional efforts to investigate those payments.

This much-needed legislation would not only ensure that such payments could not be hidden from Congress and the Americans they represents, it outright prohibits payments to state sponsors of terrorism and foreign terrorist organizations, which should be one of the least controversial actions ever to grace the floor of this House.

As I have said before, transparency and accountability are the best remedies for a government run amuck. Title III of H.R. 469, Chairman GOODLATTE's legislation, the Article I Amicus and Intervention Act, will further strengthen Congress' powers under Article I and, in doing so, will help restore checks and balances between the three branches of government.

When the Federal courts are deciding important matters regarding the Constitution, congressional powers, and Federal law, it is critical that Congress have the opportunity, should it deem the action necessary, to file an amicus or otherwise intervene in pending litigation.

The need for this legislation is compounded when, as was the case during the previous administration, the executive branch decides not to defend constitutionality of Federal law. This leads our adversarial legal system without anyone to litigate significant cases and shifts interpretation of the Constitution from the courts to the executive branch.

This provision will ensure that the House, like the Senate, has a statutory right to file amicus briefs or intervene when Congress' powers and responsibilities are called into question.

The Article I Amicus and Intervention Act, like the other bills contained in this measure, is an important step toward restoring government transparency, balance, and accountability.

Mr. Speaker, you might be able to detect a theme that is emerging here today. My colleagues and I are working hard to ensure the American people have a government by the people and for the people. We are working to restore the balance of powers that our forefathers put into place and to ensure that the executive overreach that was the hallmark of the previous administration won't be able to undermine transparency in the future.

In that vein, the rule also provides for consideration of the Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act. The Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act prevents the Department of Justice from subverting Congress' power of the purse by prohibiting settlements that direct payments to a nonvictim third party. Again, the misdirection of funds to irrelevant third parties is a problem that we have seen grow and that must be addressed.

Under the previous administration, the Department of Justice funneled nonvictim third party groups as much

as \$880 million. The Department of Justice did this by collecting money from parties who had broken the law and then using that money to create a slush fund for special interest groups rather than sending the money to victims of illicit activity.

The Department of Justice allowed the "donations" required under the settlements to count as double credit against defendants' payment obligations. Let me say that again. The Department of Justice allowed the "donations" required under the settlements to count as double credit against defendants' payment obligations.

Interestingly, in some settlements under the previous administration, credit for direct relief to consumers was counted only as dollar for dollar, indicating the importance the Department of Justice places on directing these funds to nonvictim third party groups.

The Department of Justice's policy move actually incentivized the funneling of money to nonvictim groups rather than the people who were injured. The slush fund scheme actually disadvantaged victims in favor of special interests.

□ 1230

For example, the Department of Justice negotiated settlement agreements to the tune of millions of dollars with major banks for misleading investors over mortgage-backed securities.

Then the Department of Justice said that banks or other parties that it settled with could meet some of their settlement obligations by making, again, donations to certain groups. The money went to these groups partially under the guise that those groups would provide services to the aggrieved parties.

In reality, this practice directs funds away from the victims and allows the Department of Justice to steer money to nonvictim third-party groups, usually politically motivated organizations.

Additionally, the parties that receive the funds, these nonvictim third-party organizations, aren't a part of the case at all. This means that they don't represent the victims and aren't subject to congressional oversight for the funds they receive. Even if most of these groups weren't activist groups, which many were, this scenario should concern everyone, Mr. Speaker. In fact, many of these groups are political or ideological in nature.

Under the previous administration, in the mortgage settlement cases, groups like the National Council of La Raza received more than \$1 million in Department of Housing and Urban Development grants under these settlements.

I don't know about you, but I think when the DOJ requires a settlement, the funds should go to the victims involved in the case, including victims back home in northeast Georgia. If the victims cannot be found or if the prob-

lem cannot be directly rectified, then the settlement funds should go to the Treasury so that Congress, elected by individual Americans, can appropriately decide how to use them.

I don't think it is acceptable to shortchange victims to benefit special interest and politically friendly third-party organizations.

It is time to reassert congressional authority over this process so that hardworking folks are protected from more executive overreach and so that we can restore the separation of powers outlined in the Constitution.

I am here fighting to make sure that the Federal Government puts the hardworking Georgians whom I represent and the rest of the citizens of the United States—not special interests—first.

These bills help ensure that the American citizens have their voices heard, that they regain input into the system, and that the Federal Government is more transparent, accountable, and responsive to their needs.

I would encourage others who share that goal to support this rule and the underlying bills.

Again, as you look ahead for this, the thing that hopefully came out in this is that this is an Article I issue. This is simply about, over time, that has given a way from us in this body that we have done, that it is now time to reassess that, especially in light of the needs of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank my friend, the gentleman from Georgia, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today to debate the rule for consideration of H.R. 469, the Congressional Article I Powers Strengthening Act; and H.R. 732, the Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act, two Judiciary bills that are deficient in both process and in substance.

First, let me address the Congressional Article I Powers and Strengthening Act, a bill that my Republican friends purport will provide common-sense solutions to curbing regulatory abuse, but will, in fact, undermine the ability of Federal regulators to protect the health and safety of Americans, threaten the privacy of victims of government misconduct, and intrude on the Department of Justice's enforcement discretion, raising serious separation of powers concerns.

Mr. Speaker, just as appalling as the substance of this bill is the process by which we are considering it and many other bills deriving from the Judiciary Committee lately.

This bill is actually three Judiciary Committee bills wrapped in one Rules Committee print. However, one of the bills, H.R. 4070, was introduced last week without a hearing, without a markup, without notice to Democrats on the Judiciary Committee, and without consultation with constitutional

lawyers and experts and interested citizens.

This process is truly a slap in the face of regular order. A bill that has zero input from members on the Judiciary Committee or been the subject of any thoughtful discussion is suddenly on the House floor for a vote.

Interestingly, when I listened to my friend from Georgia, who I know is particularly serious about his approaches to legislation, I sat here and then I looked into the gallery, and there were 20 people who were seated there. I didn't see on the faces of those that I could see any understanding of one thing that he said, not because of the speed of his manner of speech, but because of the complexity of issues that give rise to us.

Among the things he said was transparency, accountability, and wanting to make sure that we, this body, exercise our prerogative with reference to for the people, by the people, and of the people.

I would imagine that people listening to this debate would want to believe that half of this body, half of the people who are represented in this country had input to this legislation. Let me tell you, People, they had none, zero. No Democrat had any input to this measure that I just discussed.

How can we expect Members of this body, let alone the American people, to have any idea as to what we are voting on with this measure and what its impact will be when it seems the path it took to getting a vote is based solely on the whim of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee?

Unfortunately, there is total disregard for even a semblance of regular order. That term is utilized a lot here, and, again, the American people, many of them, don't have a clue what we are talking about.

What we are talking about, basically, is matters that go to committees have hearings, have both sides have input, have witnesses who are experts or have responsibilities in that arena, and then the matter comes to the Rules Committee and is granted a bill of substance to come here to the floor, and that process is generally known by those of us with Congress-speak as regular order.

It is nothing new for the Republican-controlled Judiciary Committee, which has been the worst offender of regular order, when it comes to pushing for a closed process.

During the 115th Congress, bills coming to the floor from the Judiciary Committee were granted the most closed rules of any of the committees in this august body, eight closed rules. There is no committee chair in this Congress who has requested the Republican-controlled Rules Committee grant more closed rules than the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Indeed, this departure from a process that we refer to as regular order, from a process that allows input from outside experts and other witnesses, a

process that allows both parties, if there is a hearing, to ask questions of those witnesses, this departure is astounding, and that is within the context of this Congress, which, in just the first 10 months, will soon become the most closed Congress in history.

I remember when I ran for office in 1992, I appeared a lot on radio stations. In many of those appearances, the opposition, not just my opponent, but the major party, had begun a drumbeat of the Democrats are not following regular order, they are having closed rules.

Little did I know in 1992, nor did I aspire when I came here, to be on the Rules Committee to have a better understanding, but I kept listening to this closed rule argument, and many persons lost their elections because of that.

If there is ever a time for us to address it, it would be now. We have that prerogative to be able to open up this process so that all Members can be involved.

When this Congress began, the distinguished Speaker of this body promised an open and transparent House. He called for a return to regular order. After what we have seen over the last 10 months, I shudder to think what the distinguished Speaker considers a closed process.

I might add, the next tier under closed is structured rules, which we are here today on, which, yet again, limits the number of activities by others, amendments, and other processes that would be appropriate.

Yesterday, when my colleague and I were in the Rules Committee, we had before us matters that were germane to this issue that were denied, that could have, under an open process, been made in order so that we could discuss it here today.

This Republican process, shutting out the voice and input of representatives of nearly half the country, is not just an affront to normal House procedure, which it is, it is downright undemocratic and emblematic of the Republican majority's true inability to govern.

Mr. Speaker, I turn to the second bill encompassed in this rule, H.R. 732, a bill as misguided and substantively unnecessary as the first bill was lacking in process. In fact, in the last Congress, a law professor testifying on an identical bill described it as a solution in search of a problem.

That was as true in the last Congress as it is in this one, which is too bad, because we do not lack in actual problems in desperate need of sensible solutions.

H.R. 732 would prevent Federal agencies from requiring third-party payments, such as those to charities, in settlement agreements with entities accused of wrongdoing.

Now, there in the report pointed out by the chairman of the Rules Committee yesterday shows the number of banks and mortgage companies and

others that have violated the law and entered into settlements with the government for billions of dollars. Such payments, in excess of what the victims have agreed to, and the settlements that have been entered into and approved by judges, each one of these settlements, my friend said these payments may have gone to politically motivated—may be politically motivated organizations, and he cites to La Raza, which did receive money, but so did other charitable organizations: the New Christian Joy Full Gospel Baptist Church, the Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Chicago, the Catholic Charities Financial and Housing Counseling.

We sought yesterday while we were in the committee—I sought and asked staff to provide for me some of the organizations that my friends say may be politically motivated, or activists, as he referred to them, and it is 49 pages of organizations that were available to receive these funds, and, yes, some of them are liberal and also some of them are conservative organizations as we know them.

Such payments to charities are a common enforcement tool in settlements and have long been used to help provide communities with relief from systemic harm caused by illegal behavior.

Now, for example, following the 2008 financial crisis, in some of the settlement agreements with Wall Street banks, President Obama's Department of Justice required banks to donate money to charities committed to neighborhood stabilization and foreclosure prevention efforts, and this made perfect sense.

□ 1245

In the wake of the crisis, as many as 10 million families lost their homes to foreclosure. Both the Government Accountability Office and the Federal courts have long upheld this practice in settlement agreements. Perhaps unsurprisingly, my Republican colleagues considered these provisions to be an attempt by President Obama's administration to use, as they say, "a slush fund," to enrich, "liberal friends," despite the fact that certified charities eligible to receive these payments encompass liberal and conservative groups alike.

They even launched an investigation which yielded no credible evidence to substantiate their claims. Yet, despite the GAO, the Federal courts, and a Republican-led investigation showing no wrongdoing, we are considering this bill today to ban this longstanding legal practice aimed at assisting communities in the wake of suffering systemic abuse—abuse that I will underline again, and even say slowly, hurt Democrats and Republicans.

I suppose the only question left to ask my Republican friends is, 10 months into the new administration, nearly a year after the last election, why are they continuing to conduct

pointless and partisan oversight of the Obama administration?

Let me see if I can make this clear. President Obama is no longer the President of the United States, nor is Bill Clinton or George Bush. The President of the United States now is a new individual who we have to deal with, and it would be helpful if we were to address some of the matters ongoing that this particular administration is deserving of oversight.

I know that President Obama was a useful foil for many in the Republican Party when it came to messaging and campaigning, but he is not the President anymore. He won his two elections. That is the past. This bill represents nothing but the Republican majority grasping at straws and trying their best to turn their oversight attention away from doing their duty and providing oversight of the Trump administration.

Today, two new inquiries, I don't even have the time or wouldn't take the time to go into the inquiries that ain't going nowhere, have been announced, certainly as a distraction to many of the negatives that come out by virtue of this particular Congress not having done anything. It is the do-nothing Congress on steroids.

If there was ever an administration that needed rigorous oversight, it is the current one. In just 10 months, we have had reports of gratuitous use of private jets, the use of private email servers by senior staff, and I might add that one of those things identified today is they are going to go after Hillary or have oversight hearings on Hillary Clinton's emails. Enough already. Hillary Clinton lost her election, and lost with the emails as well, but we have current staff who are using private email servers. Given your history, should that not at least pique your oversight interest?

Spending tens of millions of taxpayers' dollars to use Mar-a-Lago for official meetings, waste, cronyism, the list goes on and on and on. How about oversight of a little, old company in Montana that doesn't have any successful history getting a \$200 million no-bid contract in Puerto Rico to reestablish those facilities there? Out of Montana, little, old company, \$200 million, no-bid. You got it. You go forward. You talk about waste and cronyism. And what do we get from the Republicans? Deafening silence.

Mr. Speaker, I find it ironic that we are considering the rule for a bill today entitled Article I Powers Strengthening Act when this Republican Congress has shown they can't even undertake the basic Article I duty of providing oversight of the executive. They don't need to strengthen Article I, they need to just start doing their jobs in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART) from the Sec-

ond District. He is a sponsor of the Judgment Fund Transparency Act.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for bringing up H.R. 469, which includes, as indicated, the text of my bill, the Judgment Fund Transparency Act.

The purpose of this act is really very simple. Actually, contrary to previous arguments, the rule of this and the intent of this is so simple. It is simply for government transparency. This bill will go a long way in providing our constituents and taxpayers a better idea of how their tax dollars are spent.

Now, heaven knows, and for heaven's sake, those of us here, we certainly know, the Federal Government isn't perfect. It is prone to errors that can cause harm to individuals or organizations from time to time, and when these errors are particularly egregious, the government is sued and damages are awarded to those who are harmed.

Early on, in fact, this Congress spent a large part of its time doing nothing but sorting through claims and making appropriations to pay those claims. In fact, not even 100 years ago, much of this body's work consumed only that topic, and it wasn't until 1956 that Congress established the Judgment Fund and gave authority to the Treasury Department to resolve these claims in "a permanent and definite appropriation." That simply has been abused.

In keeping with the law's requirement to report on the fund from time to time, the Treasury Department files a yearly report of the Judgment Fund with Congress, and also maintains a web page that can be searched.

Now, this sounds good. Right? But the cryptic and otherwise limited information related to each payout has made the database almost entirely worthless. There is no information on what the government did wrong. There is no information on the claimant. In fact, journalists and transparency groups revealed in the last few months that from 2009 to 2015, the government paid out more than \$25 million to unnamed or redacted recipients. A \$25 million secret. We don't know who was paid, we don't know why they were paid, and, in some circumstances, we don't know how much they were paid.

Now, we are all familiar with the previous administration's decision to take \$1.3 billion out of the fund, convert it to cash, and deliver it to Iran, yet this isn't the only egregious use of this fund.

Three years ago, The New York Times reported on what was likely an illegal billion-dollar payout to thousands of farmers who had never even sued the government. This isn't just unacceptable, it is crazy. It is horrible government. It is the type of thing that makes people resent the Federal Government.

This bill aims to clarify and to reduce that. It aims to clean up the ambiguity that exists between the current law and provide much-needed transparency. It would require the Treasury

to make public any payment from the Judgment Fund and to include very simple things that common sense would surely demand: the name of the agency named in the judgment, the name of the plaintiff, the amount they were paid, any other fees such as attorneys' fees or interest, and then finally a brief description of the facts which led to the claim.

The Judgment Fund Transparency Act may not prevent bad decisions by all government employees or government agencies, but it will shine a light on those decisions to the American people. This is about helping to increase the amount of trust between the American people and a government that they simply don't trust. We give them reasons not to trust us. Let's bring accountability and transparency to that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on passage of this crucial bill.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am ready to have my friend understand that I am getting close to closing. I don't think I have any speakers, but I do have words that I wish to put forward right now.

It is shameful that we would be in a position where the DACA program is being threatened without a single thought to the consequences this decision would have on the 800,000 young lives this program protects.

While this may appear to be off message with regard to the measures that are before us, the minority is given an opportunity to present what is called a previous question, and it can be on matters germane to the thoughts of the minority and can be on any subject that they choose. In this instance, we choose to, with the previous question, address DACA.

Do the American people even want DACA to end? The answer is clearly no. According to a Politico/Morning Consult poll, support for allowing these immigrants to remain in the United States spans across party lines: 84 percent of Democrats, 74 percent of Independents, and 69 percent of Republicans think they should stay. Congress must act to protect our DREAMers.

Mr. Speaker, here is a chance to rectify the President's decision and restore the American people's faith in this institution.

If we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3440, the Dream Act. This bipartisan bicameral legislation would help thousands of young people who are Americans in every way except on paper.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of this amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), from Georgia's 12th Congressional District, to speak on these issues of Article I.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support my fellow Georgian's, Congressman DOUG COLLINS, bill, H.R. 469.

One of the biggest complaints I hear about the Federal Government is the lack of accountability or these back-room deals. One glaring example of this is what is referred to as sue and settlement litigation.

Under previous administrations, left-leaning groups would sue a Federal agency to try and enact regulatory changes without going through the normal rulemaking process. Both parties, the Federal Government and special interest groups, settle in court with an already-agreed-upon deal.

Regulatory rules are then made quickly without any public notice or the input of any other relevant parties but carry the rule of law.

These new rules are often the most burdensome and cost our businesses billions of dollars each year. This doesn't sound like draining the swamp to me.

H.R. 469 stops these unfair arrangements by requiring agencies to publicly post and report to Congress on sue and settlement complaints, consent decrees, and settlement arrangements. It also prohibits the same-day filing of complaints and settlement agreements in cases seeking to compel agency action.

Congressman COLLINS' legislation, the Sunshine for Regulations and Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act, will provide greater accountability and transparency to the American public, while stopping special interests from improperly influencing our Nation's regulatory regime. We must uphold a fair and transparent regulatory process. The American people demand this from us.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule on this commonsense legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, earlier I mentioned that there were 49 pages—I didn't realize how extensive it really was—of organizations that were eligible to receive funds under the Justice Department's prerogative. It includes organizations that did, in fact, receive these funds.

□ 1300

They come from a wide array of organizations in our respective communities that, in my judgment, have on-the-ground ability to be efficient and to make sure that the expenditure of those funds benefit those who have suffered from systemic inequities by large organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a portion of these organizations that

were eligible to receive funds under the Justice Department's prerogative.

AGENCY NAME

Money Management International, Anchorage, AK.; Neighborworks Anchorage Formerly Anchorage Neighborhood Housing Services; Organized Community Action Programs Inc.—Covington County; Birmingham Urban League, Inc.; Gateway Financial Freedom/CCCS of Central Alabama; Jefferson County Committee for Economic Opportunity; Jefferson County Housing Authority; NACA (Neighborhood Assistance Corporation of America) Birmingham, AL; Neighborhood Housing Services of Birmingham, Inc.; United Way of Central Alabama, Inc.; United Way of Central Alabama, Inc.; Community Action Partnership of North Alabama—Cullman Branch; Community Action Partnership of North Alabama, Inc.; Community Action Agency of Northwest Alabama, Inc.; Hale Empowerment and Revitalization Organization (HERO); Organized Community Action Programs Inc.—Butler County; Organized Community Action Programs Inc.—Lowndes County; CCCS of Tennessee River Valley; Community Action Partnership, Huntsville/Madison & Limestone Counties, Inc.; Family Services Center, Inc.

CCCS of Mobile—Jackson; Telamon Corporation; CCCS of Mobile; Center for Fair Housing; Mobile Housing Board; CCCS of Alabama—Montgomery; Legal Services Alabama Inc.; CCCS of Mobile—Montrose AL; Community Action Partnership of North Alabama—Moulton Branch; Organized Community Action Programs Inc.—Dale County; Housing Authority of the City of Prichard; Community Action Agency of Northwest Alabama—Franklin County; Organized Community Action Programs Inc.—Crenshaw County; Community Action Agency of Northwest Alabama—Colbert County; Organized Community Action Program, Inc.; Community Service Programs of West Alabama, Inc.; Organized Community Action Programs Inc.—Bullock County; Credit Counseling of Arkansas—Bentonville; Mississippi County, Arkansas Economic Opportunity Commission, Inc.; Hope Enterprise Corporation.

Family Service Agency—CCCS; Arkansas River Valley Area Council, Inc.; Money Management International El Dorado; Credit Counseling of Arkansas; Crawford Sebastian Community Development Council; Credit Counseling of Arkansas Fort Smith; Northwest Regional Housing Authority; Southern Bancorp Community Partners; Jonesboro Urban Renewal and Housing Authority Housing and Community Development Organization (JURHA HCDO); Arkansas Development Finance Authority; Better Community Development, Inc.; Community Resources Technicians, Inc.; Family Service Agency—CCCS; In Affordable Housing, Incorporated; NACA (Neighborhood Assistance Corporation of America) Little Rock, AR; Southern Bancorp Community Partners; Universal Housing Development Corporation; Credit Counseling of Arkansas—Springdale; Southeastern Arizona Governments Organization; Community Action Human Resources Agency.

Housing Solutions of Northern Arizona, Inc.; Money Management International, Inc. Flagstaff, AZ; Northern Arizona Council of Governments; Administration of Resources and Choices; Money Management International, Inc. Glendale, AZ; Western Arizona Council of Governments (WACOG)—Kingman Branch Office; Housing Counseling and Education Services; Money Management International, Inc. Mesa, AZ; Springboard—Mesa; Chicanos Por La Causa—Nogales; Nogales Community Development Corporation; Chicanos Por La Causa, Phoenix; City of Phoe-

nix Neighborhood Services Department; Community Housing Resources of Arizona; Desert Mission Neighborhood Renewal; Greater Phoenix Urban League; Labor's Community Service Agency; Money Management International Phoenix Phone Center; Money Management International, Inc. Phoenix, AZ Central.

NACA (Neighborhood Assistance Corporation of America) Phoenix, AZ; Neighborhood Housing Services of Phoenix; NID-HCA Phoenix Randolph; Take Charge America; Money Management International, Inc. Prescott, AZ; Campesinos Sin Fronteras; Comite De Bien Estar, Inc.; Credit Advisors Foundation; Money Management International, Inc. Phoenix, AZ—North; Housing America Corporation; Greenpath Debt Solutions; Money Management International, Inc. Tempe, AZ; Newtown Community Development Corporation; Administration of Resources and Choices; Catholic Community Services of So. Arizona, Inc. DBA Pio Decimo Center; Chicanos Por La Causa-Tucson; Family Housing Resources; Money Management International, Inc. Tucson, AZ—SE; Money Management, Inc. Tucson, AZ—NW; Old Pueblo Housing Development, Inc.

Southern Arizona Legal Aid, Inc.; Southwest Fair Housing Counsel; The Primavera Foundation, Inc.; Tucson Urban League; Northern Arizona Council of Governments; Western Arizona Council of Governments (WACOG); Western Arizona Council of Governments NCOA HECM; Consumer Credit Counseling Service of Orange County; CCCS of the North Coast; CCCS of Kern and Tulare Counties; Community Housing Council of Kern Co.; Consumer Credit Counseling Service of Orange County; Korean Resource Center; Surepath Financial Solutions; Consumer Credit Counselors of Kern and Tulare Counties; Money Management International Chula Vista; California Rural Legal Assistance—Coachella; Clearpoint Credit Counseling Solutions—Commerce Branch; Catholic Charities of the East Bay; Eden Council for Hope and Opportunity (ECHO).

Money Management International Concord; National Asian American Coalition (Formerly Known as Mabuhay Alliance); California Rural Legal Assistance—Delano; Able Works; Springboard—El Cajon; California Rural Legal Assistance—El Centro; Inland Fair Housing and Mediation Board—El Centro Branch (Imperial County); Community Housing Works; Pacific Community Services Fairfield; Consumer Credit Counseling Service of Orange County; Money Management International Fremont; Project Sentinel; California Rural Legal Assistance—Fresno; Clearpoint Credit Counseling Solutions Inc.—Fresno Branch; Community Housing Council of Fresno; Housing Authority of the City of Fresno; California Rural Legal Assistance—Gilroy; Project Sentinel; Clearpoint Credit Counseling Solutions—Glendale Branch; Clearpoint Credit Counseling Solutions—Granada Hills Branch.

NACA (Neighborhood Assistance Corporation of America) Los Angeles, CA; Eden Council for Hope and Opportunity (ECHO); Springboard—Hemet; Inland Fair Housing and Mediation Board—Indio Branch (Riverside County); Amador Tuolumne Community Action Agency; Springboard—Ladera; Clearpoint Credit Counseling Solutions—Lakewood Branch; California Rural Legal Assistance—Lamont; Pure Hearts R Us Housing Corporation; Eden Council for Hope and Opportunity (ECHO); Tri-Valley Housing Opportunity Center; Home Preservation and Prevention (HPP Cares); Operation Hope Inc.—Long Beach Branch; Springboard—Long Beach; East La Community Corporation (ELACC); Korean Churches for Community Development; Korean Resource Center; Los Angeles Neighborhood Housing Services,

Inc.; New Economics for Women; NID-HCA Reeves;

Operation Hope, Inc.; Operation Hope, Inc.—La Branch; Shalom Center for T.R.E.E. of Life; Thai Community Development Corp.; Watts Century Latino Org.; West Angeles Community Development Corp.; California Rural Legal Assistance—Madera; California Rural Legal Assistance—Marysville Office; Operation Hope, Inc.—Maywood Branch; National Asian American Coalition (Formerly Known As Mabuhay Alliance); California Rural Legal Assistance—Modesto; Community Housing and Shelter Services; Habitat for Humanity, Stanislaus County; Project Sentinel; Montebello Housing Development Corp.; California Rural Legal Assistance—Monterey; Fair Housing Council of Riverside County, Inc.; Project Sentinel; Eden Council for Hope and Opportunity (ECHO); Habitat for Humanity East Bay/Silicon Valley.

Money Management International Oakland; NACA (Neighborhood Assistance Corporation of America) Oakland, CA; National Association of Real Estate Brokers—Investment Division, Inc.; NID-HCA Oakland Main Branch; Operation Hope, Inc.—Oakland Branch; The Spanish Speaking Unity Council of Alameda County, Inc. (The Unity Council); Faith Based Community Development Corporation; Money Management International Oceanside; Inland Fair Housing and Mediation Board; Neighborhood Partnership Housing Services, Inc.; Neighborhood Housing Services of Orange County; California Rural Legal Assistance—Oxnard; Ventura County Community Development Corporation; Fair Housing Council of Riverside County, Inc.; Eden Council for Hope and Opportunity (ECHO); California Rural Legal Assistance—Paso Robles; Pacific Community Services, Inc.; Operation Hope, Inc.—Poway Branch; Hometown Community Development Corp. DbA Homestrong USA; Housing Opportunities Collaborative—Inland Empire Branch.

Community Housing Development Corporation of North Richmond; Richmond Neighborhood Housing Services, Inc.; Community Connect; Fair Housing Council of Riverside County, Inc.; Springboard—Shine Center (Latham); Springboard Non Profit Consumer Credit Management Inc.—HPF Affiliate; Springboard Non—Profit Consumer Credit Management, Inc.; Clearpoint Credit Counseling Solutions—Sacramento Branch; Sacramento Home Loan Counseling Center; Sacramento Neighborhood Housing Services, Inc.; California Rural Legal Assistance—Salinas; Housing Resource Center of Monterey County; Clearpoint Credit Counseling Solutions—San Bernardino Branch; Neighborhood Housing Services of The Inland Empire, Inc.; NID-HCA Inland Empire J. Jackson; Bayside Community Center; Clearpoint Credit Counseling Solutions—San Diego Branch; Community Housing Works; Housing Opportunities Collaborative; Housing Opportunities Collaborative—Branch for San Diego/Imperial Counties; Money Management International San Diego.

National Asian American Coalition (Formerly Known As Mabuhay Alliance); Navicore Solutions—San Diego, CA; Neighborhood House Association; San Diego Urban League; Union of Pan Asian Communities; Asian Incorporated; CCCS of San Francisco; Consumer Credit Counseling Service of San Francisco—HPF Affiliate; Mission Economic Development Association (MEDA); Project Sentinel; San Francisco Housing Development Corporation; Neighborhood Housing Services Silicon Valley; Project Sentinel; Santa Clara County Asian Law Alliance; Surepath Financial Solutions—San Jose; NID-HCA San Leandro—Chambers; California Rural Legal Assistance—San Luis Obispo; Peoples' Self Help Housing; Fair

Housing of Marin; Clearpoint Credit Counseling Solutions—Santa Ana Branch.

Consumer Credit Counseling Service of Orange County; Housing Opportunities Collaborative—Orange County Branch; Legal Aid Society of Orange County; Orange County Fair Housing Council, Inc.; California Rural Legal Assistance—Santa Barbara; Project Sentinel; California Rural Legal Assistance; California Rural Legal Assistance—Santa Maria; Wise & Healthy Aging; California Rural Legal Assistance;

Catholic Charities, Diocese of Santa Rosa; CCCS of San Francisco; Centro Familia Esperanza; Operation Hope Inc.—South Gate Branch; California Rural Legal Assistance—Stockton; Clearpoint Credit Counseling Solutions—Stockton Branch; NID-HCA A. Jones; Visionary Home Builders of California; Project Sentinel; Northern Circle Indian Housing Authority, United Native Housing Development Corp.

City of Vacaville Department of Housing Services; Cabrillo Economic Development Corporation; Inland Fair Housing and Mediation Board—Victorville Branch (San Bernardino County); CCCS of Kern and Tulare Counties; Community Services and Employment Training, Inc. (CSET); Self Help Enterprises; California Rural Legal Assistance—Oceanside; Surepath Financial Solutions—Watsonville; Rural Community Assistance Corporation; Community Resource and Housing Development Corporation—Alamosa; City of Aurora Community Development Division; Boulder County Housing Authority; Greenpath, Inc.; Upper Arkansas Area Council of Governments; CCCS of Greater Dallas—Colorado Springs; Adams County Housing Authority; Colorado Housing and Finance Authority; Colorado Housing Assistance Corporation; Del Norte Neighborhood Development Corporation (NDC); Denver Housing Authority.

Greenpath, Inc.; Money Management International Denver, Aurora Branch; NACA (Neighborhood Assistance Corporation of America) Denver, CO; NEWSED CDC; Northeast Denver Housing Center; Southwest Improvement Council; Housing Solutions for the Southwest; Regional Housing Alliance La Plata Homes Fund; Brothers Redevelopment, Inc.; Greenpath Debt Solutions; Neighbor to Neighbor; Northeast Colorado Housing, Inc.; Tri-County Housing & Community Development Corporation; Neighbor to Neighbor; Grand Junction Housing Authority; Greenpath Debt Solutions; Money Management International Highlands Ranch; Douglas County Housing Partnership; Boulder County Housing Authority; Neighbor to Neighbor.

Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Pueblo, CO; Neighborworks of Pueblo; Summit County Family Resource Center; San Miguel Regional Housing Authority; Community Resources and Housing Development Corporation; Money Management International Westminster; Bridgeport Neighborhood Trust; Housing Development Fund, Inc.—Bridgeport Branch; Housing Development Fund—Danbury Branch; Financial Counselors of America Connecticut Branch; Money Management International East Hartford; Community Renewal Team, Inc.; Hartford Areas Rally Together; Housing Education Resource Center; Mutual Housing Association of Greater Hartford, Inc.; NACA (Neighborhood Assistance Corporation of America) Hartford, CT; Urban League of Greater Hartford, Inc.; Money Management International Milford; Neighborhood Housing Services of New Britain, Inc.; Greater New Haven Community Loan Fund.

Mutual Housing of South Central CT, Inc.// Neighborworks New Horizons; Neighborhood Housing Services of New Haven; Catholic Charities, Norwich, CT; Connecticut Housing

Finance Authority; Housing Development Fund, Inc.; Urban League of Southern Connecticut; Neighborhood Housing Services of Waterbury, Inc.; National Council on Aging (NCOA); Asian American Homeownership Counseling; Carecen—Central American Resource Center; Greater Washington Urban League; Homefree—USA Washington DC Branch; Housing Counseling Services, Incorporated; Latino Economic Development Corporation; Lydia's House; Manna, Inc. Marshall Heights Community Development Organization; NACA (Neighborhood Assistance Corporation of America) Washington, DC; National Capad; National Community Reinvestment Coalition.

National Community Reinvestment Coalition, Inc.; National Council of La Raza; National Foundation for Credit Counseling, Inc.; Neighborhood Reinvestment Corp. DBA Neighborworks America; NID-HCA Williams; Operation Hope, Inc.—DC Branch; United Planning Organization; United Planning Organization—Anacostia Center; United Planning Organization—Petey Greene Community Svc. Center; United Planning Organization Shaw Community Svc. Center; University Legal Services; University Legal Services; CCCS of Maryland and Delaware; Delaware State Housing Authority; First State Community Action Agency, Inc.; National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor Research Fund, Inc. (NCALL Research, Inc.); First State Community Action Agency, Inc.; National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor Research Fund, Inc. (NCALL, Research, Inc.); Hockessin Community Center; First State Community Action Agency, Inc.

National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor Research Fund, Inc. (NCALL Research, Inc.); YWCA Delaware; Telamon Corporation; CCCS of Delaware Valley, DBA Clarifi; CCCS of Delaware Valley, Inc. DBA Clarifi; CCCS of Maryland and Delaware; Delaware Community Reinvestment Action Council; Housing Opportunities of Northern Delaware, Inc.; Interfaith Community Housing of Delaware; Neighborhood House, Incorporated; West End Neighborhood House; Homes in Partnership, Inc.; We Help Community Development Corporation; Florida Cooperative Extension—Holmes County Cooperative Extension Service (Terminated); Boynton Beach Faith Based CDC; Catholic Charities Diocese of Venice, Inc.; Manatee Community Action Agency, Inc. F/K/A Manatee Opportunity Council, Incorporated; Florida Cooperative Extension Levy County Cooperative Extension Service; Florida Cooperative Extension—Hernando County Cooperative Extension Service; All-American Foreclosure Solutions, Inc.

Cape Coral Housing Development Corporation; Florida Cooperative Extension—Washington County Cooperative Extension Service (Terminated); Bright Community Trust, Inc.; Clearwater Neighborhood Housing Services, Inc.; Consumer Credit and Budget Counseling, DBA National Foundation for Debt Management; Consumer Credit and Budget Counseling, DBA National Foundation for Debt Management; Housing Services of Central Florida; Tampa Bay Community Development Corporation; Homes in Partnership, Incorporated; Credit Card Mgmt Svcs, Inc. D/B/A Debthelper.Com; Florida Cooperative Extension—Brevard County Cooperative Extension Service; Florida Cooperative Extension—Brevard County Cooperative Extension Service (Duplicate); CCCS of West FL; Florida Cooperative Extension Dixie County Cooperative Extension Service; Florida Cooperative Extension—Pasco County Cooperative Extension Service (Terminated); Adopt A Hurricane Family, Inc. DBA Crisis Housing Solutions; Apprises—CCCS—Davie; Florida

Cooperative Extension—Broward County Cooperative Extension; Central Florida Community Development Corporation; Community Legal Services of Mid-Florida, Inc.

Mid-Florida Housing Partnership, Inc.; Florida Cooperative Extension—Walton County Cooperative Extension Service; Florida Cooperative Extension—Volusia County Cooperative Extension Service; H.E.L.P. Community Development Corp.; Affordable Housing by Lake, Inc.; Centro Campesino, Farmworkers Center, Inc.; New Visions Community Development Corporation; Urban League of Broward County Main Office; Urban League of Broward County (Branch Office); Affordable Homeownership Foundation Inc.; Home Ownership Resource Center of Lee County; Housing Authority of the City of Ft. Myers; Lee County Housing Development Corporation; CCCS of West FL; City of Gainesville Housing Division; Florida Cooperative Extension; Florida Cooperative Extension—Alachua County Cooperative Extension Service; Florida Cooperative Extension—Alachua County Cooperative Extension Service (Duplicate); Neighborhood Housing & Development Corporation; CCCS of the Midwest.

Community Housing Partners Corporation; Community Legal Services of Mid-Florida, Inc.—Inverness Office; Black Bottom/Springfield Human Development Corporation, DBA St. Joseph Homeownership; Community Home Ownership Center, Inc. F/K/A Jacksonville FL Chapter Assoc. of Housing Counselors & Agencies CDC; Family Foundations of Northeast Florida, Inc.; Florida Cooperative Extension—Duval County Cooperative Extension Service; Greenpath, Inc.; Habitat for Humanity of Jacksonville, Inc.; Jacksonville Area Legal Aid, Inc.; Jacksonville Urban League; NACA (Neighborhood Assistance Corporation of America) Jacksonville, FL; Operation New Hope CDC; Wealth Watcher, Inc.; Community Legal Services of Mid-Florida, Inc.—Kissimmee Office; Florida Cooperative Extension—Osceola County Cooperative Extension Service; The Agriculture and Labor Program, Inc.; Florida Cooperative Extension—Columbia County Extension Service; Springboard—Lake Mary; Catholic Charities of Central Florida; Keystone Challenge Fund, Inc.

Florida Cooperative Extension—Pinellas County Cooperative Extension Service; Broward County Housing Authority; Florida Cooperative Extension—Citrus County Cooperative Extension Service; Debt Management Credit Counseling Corp; Debt Management Credit Counseling Corp; Debt Management Credit Counseling Corp.; Florida Cooperative Extension—Suwannee County Cooperative Extension Service; Greenpath Debt Solutions; Florida Cooperative Extension—Baker County Cooperative Extension Service (Duplicate); Florida Cooperative Extension—Baker County Cooperative Extension Service (Terminated); Florida Cooperative Extension—Madison County Cooperative Extension Service (Terminated); Community Housing Initiative, Inc.; Cuban American National Council, Inc.—Miami; Little Haiti Housing Association, Inc.; Neighborhood Housing Services of South Florida; Real Estate, Education and Community Housing, Inc.; SER Jobs for Progress; Miami Beach Community Development Corp; NID-HCA Florida Felton; Housing Development Corporation of SW Florida, Inc.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I do want to acknowledge that my friend from Georgia does have a companion bill in the other body. I believe it is S. 333. I would—like I will when the Georgia-Florida game comes up—make a wager with my friend that that bill ain't going nowhere. But, anyway, we

are here talking about it, so my wager with the gentleman will be under appropriate measures. I wish he and I could go to Jacksonville together at what they say is the greatest cocktail party in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I just mentioned that at least one of the bills wrapped up in today's, in my view, nonsense, ought to continue to be described as a solution in search of a problem. I am not fully convinced that the observation is not an apt one for the whole lot of bills before us today. As I just mentioned, this is particularly disturbing as this country has real problems which need real solutions.

The Children's Health Insurance Program has expired, and there seems to be little to no will on the other side of the aisle to right this wrong at this time. Sure, we hear possibilities of a solution. When I came back this week, I thought that we would certainly address it. September 30 was when it expired. Yet we and, more importantly, millions of children and organizations wait for an answer.

We know that we are fast approaching a government shutdown, but instead we come to the floor week after week forced to debate ridiculous bills that, in substance, are well-thought-out by the persons presenting them, but, in reality, are not going to become law and are nothing more than talking points of the day, when these things that we should be addressing are going unmet.

We need to reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, yet the answer to this issue evades my friends across the aisle. We need to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program, yet we wait.

We need to address the crippling epidemic that is gun violence in this country. We need to remember that not even a month ago, this man out in Las Vegas took aim from the 32nd floor of a hotel and rained terror down upon thousands of innocent people enjoying a music festival. The weapons of war he used that night are just as readily available today as the day he bought them.

Finally, I understand people may want to forget the following, but we cannot, and I will not let you forget that there are millions of people across the United States Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, and there are thousands in Florida and in Texas who are still awaiting visits from FEMA.

On the plane up yesterday, I was reading a 3-page-long article addressing, right in my community, the fact that people are sitting waiting for FEMA's response. I continue to raise at the same time that these hurricanes in Texas, southwest Louisiana, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico have occurred, forest fires in California and Montana and Oregon have occurred, and we haven't addressed drought in other areas that occurred. Just last week, tornadoes occurred in Oklahoma. We have these disasters occurring.

I heard my colleague earlier today during morning hour make a presentation regarding a main burst in Detroit, Michigan, and that they don't have in her area sufficient drinking water. We know that the Flint, Michigan, matter isn't resolved.

This past weekend, I busted a tire on a bumpy-hole road, and we need to fix our roads in this country. This Capital ought to be called the "Pothole of the World."

Yet we stand here day after day discussing things that are going nowhere when people in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are craving electricity, opening schools with no electricity, moving people from hospitals. We need safe drinking water all over this country. They need for us to show compassion and at least some decency with reference to humanity with those concerns.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule and the underlying legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there are many things that this body can do better. My friend from Florida outlined his opinion of what those may be. He also outlined his opinion of what will be a nice Georgia victory come Saturday, this weekend, in Jacksonville. I do appreciate his acknowledgement of what will be coming.

But I think there are also some other things that we need to discuss, and we can talk about that. I will take, first off, the issue of the Judiciary Committee on which I serve, which I believe, frankly, I have the privilege of serving on what I believe are two of the hardest-working and longest-hour committees on this Hill, and that is the Rules Committee and the Judiciary Committee. Chairman GOODLATTE is very thoughtful.

We can disagree, Mr. Speaker, and I can understand my friend's frustration on issues of closed bills which do come and have been under both parties, but today's bills are not one of those. These two bills both have amendments that are offered on the floor by both parties. There are Republican amendments and there are Democrat amendments. This is not one of those.

So I think, from the perspective of how process and regular order—and we can go through those—I would stand with my chairman and Chairman GOODLATTE on that issue that we are working toward, and it is something that really matters here.

I think also, as we look at this, it is talking about grasping of straws. One of the things is we can get sidelined many times on looking at what could be or want to be and what we want to focus on. But also, it is a matter—as I come down here in this role many times, let's focus on the line right now, let's focus on the minute ahead, let's focus on the next vote, and that is

talking about these bills in this process.

I thought it was interesting to say that these are solutions in search of a problem. It is really interesting to me that, undoubtedly, these solutions in search of a problem—I think the problem is when they have, especially under sue and settle, \$9.6 billion annual cost, \$500 million in the first year cost; Oil and Gas Rule, \$738 million annually; \$632 million annually for the Florida Nutrient Standards and Estuary Flowing Waters Rule; Boiler MACT, \$3 billion. I mean, I could go on. And \$90 billion for reconsideration of 2008 ozone.

Let's make it very clear what sue and settle does. Sue and settle does not take the power for an agency to enter into a consent decree. Consent decrees are used often. The problem with this one is that when you have two parties on the same page suing, in essence, what amounts to one so that they can get a desired result without talking to the others who were affected, that is just wrong.

It is like me taking another congressman, or you, Mr. Speaker, and saying: You know, let's work out a deal.

But the reality is it is going to affect my friend from across the aisle, but we are not going to tell him. We are simply going to say: We are going to work our deal out. We are going to go to the Court. We are going to get the Court to sign off on it and we are going to implement everything that we have without proper insight and oversight.

That is all that we are asking for. It is called fairness. I am not sure how you could be against that, unless you like the idea of writing regulatory law in cubicles down the street instead of here on the floor of the House.

The other issue I see here is this issue of slush funds. We have talked about this, and the gentleman put 10 pages into the RECORD. He can put 49 into the Record; he can put 550 into the RECORD of eligible agencies for this money.

The problem is not eligible agencies. Number one, they are not victims. Number two, they are not part of the suit, yet we are giving it at sometimes double the rate to the offenders. Those that the Justice Department said were doing wrong—let's get this clear. Like in the housing issue—said you are doing wrong in this mortgage issue.

But what we are going to do, instead of giving the money at 1:1 back to victims, we are going to give it at 2:1 if you go to our preferred charity in donation form. It sounds like to me the only people who are getting problematic here are the victims of it; and the others of these pages of people who may or may not have political leanings or religious leanings or anything else, they are the recipient of the lottery.

They said, "We will go help these people; give us money," instead of saying this is an issue that needs to be dealt with in a settlement to the victims.

It also has been said that this is just giving money to help those in those areas so that they can get back on their feet. But it also went further than that. There were two instances in particular that I can come up with: the Housing Council, which this body said we are not funding any longer, yet the administration used these donations to circumvent the appropriations process and fund it. That is not the role of the executive branch. That is an article I role.

The electric vehicle subsidy, \$2 billion, again, this body said no. They said: No worries. We will go get a settlement. We will just take the donations and we will fund something that Congress has already said no on.

So it is easy to paint with broad strokes and say this is not important, this does not matter. But for some of us it does matter.

Those stories—why people are so upset when they look at this town is they just remember what their old civic books told them: that there was a Congress, there was an executive branch, and there was a judicial branch; each required all to do their part.

If we decide that it is too far down the road, let's bind the hands of the executive branch. We will do whatever. This is nothing except Congress saying this is what we are going to do. It is saying, this is what matters for us. And we may call it cheap; we may call it little; we may call it solutions in search of a problem, but you talk about the businessowners and the industries and the States who had to pay out on these sue and settle agreements.

When you talk about the millions—the billions that were sent to Iran, I think there will be a lot of people, when you look at both sides of this case, who will say: Yes, Congress, I want you to stop this because this is the way it should be set up.

That is why these bills are on the floor today. That is why we are taking them up. That is the reason we are bringing them forward.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 577 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3440) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on

the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3440.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule

[a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered; and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 2142.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 189, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 572]

YEAS—228

Abraham	Davidson	Hice, Jody B.
Aderholt	Davis, Rodney	Higgins (LA)
Allen	Denham	Hill
Amash	Dent	Holding
Amodel	DeSantis	Hollingsworth
Arrington	DesJarlais	Hudson
Babin	Diaz-Balart	Hultgren
Bacon	Donovan	Hunter
Banks (IN)	Duffy	Hurd
Barr	Duncan (SC)	Issa
Barton	Duncan (TN)	Jenkins (KS)
Bergman	Dunn	Jenkins (WV)
Biggs	Emmer	Johnson (LA)
Bilirakis	Estes (KS)	Johnson (OH)
Bishop (MI)	Farenthold	Johnson, Sam
Bishop (UT)	Faso	Jones
Black	Ferguson	Jordan
Blackburn	Fitzpatrick	Joyce (OH)
Blum	Fleischmann	Katko
Bost	Flores	Kelly (MS)
Brady (TX)	Fortenberry	Kelly (PA)
Brat	Fox	King (IA)
Brooks (AL)	Franks (AZ)	King (NY)
Brooks (IN)	Frelinghuysen	Kinzinger
Buck	Gaetz	Knight
Bucshon	Gallagher	Kustoff (TN)
Budd	Garrett	Labrador
Byrne	Gianforte	LaHood
Calvert	Gibbs	LaMalfa
Carter (GA)	Gohmert	Lamborn
Carter (TX)	Goodlatte	Lance
Chabot	Gosar	Latta
Cheney	Gowdy	Lewis (MN)
Coffman	Granger	LoBiondo
Cole	Graves (GA)	Loudermilk
Collins (GA)	Graves (LA)	Love
Collins (NY)	Graves (MO)	Lucas
Comer	Griffith	Luetkemeyer
Comstock	Grothman	MacArthur
Conaway	Guthrie	Marino
Cook	Handel	Marshall
Costello (PA)	Harper	Masie
Cramer	Harris	Mast
Crawford	Hartzler	McCarthy
Culberson	Hensarling	McCaul
Curbelo (FL)	Herrera Beutler	McClintock

McHenry	Roe (TN)
McKinley	Rogers (AL)
McMorris	Rogers (KY)
Rodgers	Rohrabacher
McSally	Rokita
Meadows	Rooney, Francis
Meehan	Rooney, Thomas
Messer	J.
Mitchell	Ros-Lehtinen
Moolenaar	Ross
Mooney (WV)	Rothfus
Mullin	Rouzer
Newhouse	Royce (CA)
Noem	Russell
Norman	Rutherford
Nunes	Sanford
Olson	Scalise
Palazzo	Schweikert
Palmer	Scott, Austin
Paulsen	Sensenbrenner
Pearce	Sessions
Perry	Shimkus
Pittenger	Shuster
Poe (TX)	Simpson
Poliquin	Smith (MO)
Posey	Smith (NE)
Ratcliffe	Smith (NJ)
Reichert	Smith (TX)
Renacci	Smucker
Rice (SC)	Stefanik
Roby	Stewart

NAYS—189

Adams	Garamendi	Norcross
Aguilar	Gomez	O'Halleran
Beatty	Gonzalez (TX)	O'Rourke
Bera	Gottheimer	Pallone
Beyer	Green, Al	Panetta
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Pascarell
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Payne
Blunt Rochester	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Bonamici	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Boyle, Brendan	Hastings	Peters
F.	Heck	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Higgins (NY)	Pingree
Brown (MD)	Himes	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Polis
Bustos	Huffman	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Capuano	Jayapal	Raskin
Carbajal	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Rosen
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Castro (TX)	Keating	Ruiz
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Cicilline	Kennedy	Rush
Clark (MA)	Khanna	Ryan (OH)
Clarke (NY)	Kihuen	Sánchez
Clay	Kildee	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Kind	Schiff
Cohen	Krishnamoorthi	Schneider
Connolly	Kuster (NH)	Schrader
Conyers	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Correa	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Costa	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Lawson (FL)	Shea-Porter
Crist	Lee	Shearman
Crowley	Levin	Sinema
Cuellar	Lewis (GA)	Sires
Cummings	Lieu, Ted	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Davis, Danny	Loebback	Soto
DeFazio	Lofgren	Speier
DeGette	Lowey	Suzuki
Delaney	Lujan Grisham,	Swalwell (CA)
DeLauro	M.	Takano
DelBene	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (CA)
Demings	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
DeSaulnier	Maloney,	Titus
Deutsch	Carolyn B.	Tonko
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Torres
Doggett	Matsui	Tsongas
Doyle, Michael	McCollum	Vargas
F.	McEachin	Veasey
Ellison	McGovern	Vela
Engel	McNerney	Velázquez
Eshoo	Meeke	Visclosky
Español	Meng	Walz
Esty (CT)	Moore	Wasserman
Evans	Moulton	Schultz
Foster	Murphy (FL)	Waters, Maxine
Frankel (FL)	Nader	Watson Coleman
Fudge	Napolitano	Welch
Gabbard	Neal	Yarmuth
Gallego	Nolan	

NOT VOTING—15

Barletta	Burgess	Marchant
Barragan	Carson (IN)	Reed
Bass	Huizenga	Roskam
Bridenstine	Long	Trott
Buchanan	Lowenthal	Wilson (FL)

□ 1337

Mmes. NAPOLITANO, MURPHY of Florida, Ms. SANCHEZ, SHEA-PORTER, Messrs. GALLEGO, and AL GREEN of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 572.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 190, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 573]

AYES—227

Abraham	Duffy	Jordan
Aderholt	Duncan (SC)	Joyce (OH)
Allen	Duncan (TN)	Katko
Amash	Dunn	Kelly (MS)
Amodel	Emmer	Kelly (PA)
Arrington	Estes (KS)	King (IA)
Babin	Farenthold	King (NY)
Bacon	Faso	Kinzinger
Banks (IN)	Ferguson	Knight
Barr	Fitzpatrick	Kustoff (TN)
Barton	Fleischmann	Labrador
Bergman	Flores	LaHood
Biggs	Fortenberry	LaMalfa
Bilirakis	Fox	Lamborn
Bishop (MI)	Franks (AZ)	Lance
Bishop (UT)	Frelinghuysen	Latta
Black	Gaetz	Lewis (MN)
Blackburn	Gallagher	LoBiondo
Blum	Garrett	Love
Bost	Gianforte	Lucas
Brady (TX)	Gibbs	Luetkemeyer
Brat	Gohmert	MacArthur
Brooks (IN)	Goodlatte	Marchant
Buck	Gosar	Marino
Bucshon	Gowdy	Marshall
Budd	Granger	Masie
Byrne	Graves (GA)	Mast
Calvert	Graves (LA)	McCarthy
Carter (GA)	Graves (MO)	McCaul
Carter (TX)	Grothman	McClintock
Chabot	Guthrie	McHenry
Cheney	Handel	McKinley
Coffman	Harper	McMorris
Cole	Harris	Rodgers
Collins (GA)	Hartzler	McSally
Collins (NY)	Hensarling	Meadows
Comer	Herrera Beutler	Meehan
Comstock	Hice, Jody B.	Messer
Conaway	Higgins (LA)	Mitchell
Cook	Hill	Moolenaar
Costello (PA)	Holding	Mooney (WV)
Cramer	Hollingsworth	Mullin
Crawford	Hudson	Newhouse
Culberson	Hultgren	Noem
Curbelo (FL)	Hunter	Norman
Davidson	Hurd	Nunes
Davis, Rodney	Issa	Olson
Denham	Jenkins (KS)	Palazzo
Dent	Jenkins (WV)	Palmer
DeSantis	Johnson (LA)	Paulsen
DesJarlais	Johnson (OH)	Pearce
Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam	Perry
Donovan	Jones	Pittenger

Poe (TX)
 Poliquin
 Posey
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Rice (SC)
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney, Thomas J.
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Royce (CA)
 Russell
 Rutherford

NOES—190

Adams
 Aguilar
 Beatty
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Blunt Rochester
 Bonamici
 Boyle, Brendan F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (MD)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capuano
 Carbal
 Cárdenas
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Correa
 Costa
 Courtney
 Crist
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Demings
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael F.
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Espallat
 Esty (CT)
 Evans
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard

NOT VOTING—15

Barletta
 Barragán
 Bass
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Buchanan
 Burgess
 Griffith
 Huizenga
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Lowenthal
 Rooney, Francis
 Trott
 Wilson (FL)

Upton
 Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smucker
 Stefanik
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Taylor
 Tenney
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Turner

Nolan
 Norcross
 O'Halleran
 O'Rourke
 Pallone
 Panetta
 Pascarell
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Rosen
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Soto
 Speier
 Suozzi
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tonko
 Torres
 Tsongas
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters, Maxine
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1344

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR VICTIMS OF CALIFORNIA WILDFIRES

(Mr. THOMPSON of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the worst fires in the history of California have devastated nearly 300,000 acres, destroyed some 8,000 homes, caused billions of dollars in damage, burned to the ground many businesses, and, most sadly, taken the lives of 42 people—and that number may very well rise.

These fires were like no other, propelled by winds that reached speeds of over 70 miles per hour. The worst of the fires were in my district. They moved so fast, burning at times 200 feet per second. That is three football fields every 30 seconds.

People had little time to escape their burning homes. They fled with only the clothes on their back and, in some cases, with their homes already in flames.

The most covered area on the news is a neighborhood in my district in Santa Rosa called Coffey Park. There, alone, the entire neighborhood, some 1,300 homes, were burned to the ground. The winds were so high that they pushed the blaze across eight lanes of freeway and over two frontage roads to destroy the homes and lives of those 1,300 families.

Eleven thousand firefighters, thousands of law enforcement and National Guard soldiers put their lives on the line to stop the raging inferno and protect Californians in the line of the fire. Some of those first responders lost their own homes, but they worked 24/7 to help others. The actions of civilian heroes and heroines saved an untold number of lives.

The fallout from this disaster will be felt for years, if not decades. You can't just rebuild 8,000 homes and entire neighborhoods overnight.

My colleagues and I from California appreciate all of your words of comfort and offers to help, and the people hurt by this monster fire will need all of our help.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House now observe a moment of silence for those who lost their lives in this terrifying fire and to show our commitment to help rebuild the lives of the many thousands of people who have lost everything.

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS TRAFFICKING EMERGENCY RESPONSE BY DETECTING INCOMING CONTRABAND WITH TECHNOLOGY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2142) to improve the ability of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to interdict fentanyl, other synthetic opioids, and other narcotics and psychoactive substances that are illegally imported into the United States, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 3, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 574]

YEAS—412

Abraham	Clarke (NY)	Esty (CT)
Adams	Clay	Evans
Aderholt	Cleaver	Farenthold
Aguilar	Clyburn	Faso
Allen	Coffman	Ferguson
Amodei	Cohen	Fitzpatrick
Arrington	Cole	Fleischmann
Babin	Collins (GA)	Flores
Bacon	Collins (NY)	Fortenberry
Banks (IN)	Comer	Foster
Barr	Conaway	Fox
Barton	Connolly	Franks (AZ)
Beatty	Conyers	Frelinghuysen
Bera	Cook	Fudge
Bergman	Cooper	Gabbard
Biggs	Correa	Gaetz
Bilirakis	Costa	Gallagher
Bishop (GA)	Costello (PA)	Gallego
Bishop (MI)	Courtney	Garamendi
Bishop (UT)	Cramer	Garrett
Black	Crawford	Gianforte
Blackburn	Crist	Gibbs
Blum	Crowley	Gohmert
Blumenauer	Cuellar	Gomez
Blunt Rochester	Culberson	Gonzalez (TX)
Bonamici	Cummings	Goodlatte
Bost	Curbelo (FL)	Gosar
Boyle, Brendan F.	Davidson	Gottheimer
Brady (PA)	Davis (CA)	Gowdy
Brady (TX)	Davis, Danny	Granger
Brat	Davis, Rodney	Graves (GA)
Brooks (AL)	DeFazio	Graves (LA)
Brooks (IN)	DeGette	Graves (MO)
Brown (MD)	Delaney	Green, Al
Brownley (CA)	DeLauro	Green, Gene
Buck	DelBene	Griffith
Bucshon	Demings	Grijalva
Budd	Denham	Grothman
Bustos	Dent	Guthrie
Butterfield	DeSaulnier	Gutiérrez
Byrne	DesJarlais	Hanabusa
Calvert	Deutch	Handel
Capuano	Diaz-Balart	Harper
Carbajal	Dingell	Harris
Cárdenas	Donovan	Hartzler
Carson (IN)	Doyle, Michael F.	Hastings
Carter (GA)	Duffy	Heck
Carter (TX)	Duncan (SC)	Hensarling
Cartwright	Duncan (TN)	Herrera Beutler
Castor (FL)	Dunn	Hice, Jody B.
Castro (TX)	Ellison	Higgins (LA)
Chabot	Emmer	Higgins (NY)
Cheney	Engel	Hill
Chu, Judy	Eshoo	Himes
Cicilline	Espallat	Holding
Clark (MA)	Estes (KS)	Hollingsworth
		Hoyer